

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-16, 18-33, and 46-50 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 26, 33, and 46 have been amended. No further claims have been added or canceled.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the interview on April 14, 2009. Proposed claim amendments were discussed, although no specific agreement was reached.

The Examiner objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter in independent claims 26 and 46. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 26 and 46, as amended, overcome the informalities, and accordingly, respectfully request the removal of the objection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-33 and 46-50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 00/72534 A1 (Rabe-Hesketh et al), U.S. Patent No. 6,742,043 (Moussa et al), and U.S. Patent No. 6,311,215 (Bakshi et al.).

Rabe-Hesketh discloses removing an email attachment and replacing the attachment with a link in the email. The link references the original attachment stored in a server available for later retrieval. Nonetheless, as correctly stated in the Office action, Rabe-Hesketh fails to disclose or suggest formatting attachments based on a user's formatting preference.

Moussa is directed at reformatting and delivering a requested attachment based on information indicative of an email client's capability (Moussa, Col. 16, lines 28-31). The email client makes a request for an email along with information indicative of the email client's capability (Moussa, col. 16, lines 34-46). The email server reformats the email attachment and sends the email with the reformatted email attachment to the

email client (Moussa, col. 16, lines 50-62). Nevertheless, Moussa does not disclose substituting a link in the email to the reformatted attachment in place of the reformatted attachment.

Bakshi discloses software a user uses to determine download preferences (Bakshi, Fig. 3, Col. 7, lines 7-40). The download preferences are used to indicate a preference for transcoding by a network proxy that sends content to the network client (Bakshi, Col. 7, lines 19-28). These preferences are sent to a network proxy either before or when the network client requests content (Col. 3, lines 30-47). This software is downloaded from a network proxy or transcoding server (Col. 8, lines 5-15). Thus, Bakshi discloses a network client that sends user set transformation parameters with a request to download content.

Claim 1 as amended recites:

In an online messaging system supporting transmission of attachments, a method for automatically processing e-mail messages containing attachments, the method comprising:

- specifying a preference for formatting attachments that accompany e-mail messages;
- receiving, with a server, a particular e-mail message having a particular attachment;
- detecting capabilities of an intended recipient's receiving device, wherein the detecting is performed dynamically, during a request from the intended recipient to retrieve the particular e-mail message;
- responsive to detecting the intended recipient's receiving device and responsive to identifying the particular attachment as exceeding capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device, removing the particular attachment from the particular message, and inserting a link into the particular e-mail message, said link capable of referencing a reformatted attachment based on the specified preferences;
- delivering the particular e-mail message to the intended recipient;
- and
- in response to invocation of the link by the intended recipient, receiving a request for a copy of the reformatted attachment, wherein the request includes an identification of the reformatted attachment and transformation parameters that indicate how to transform the particular

attachment to the reformatted attachment, and wherein the transformation parameters are based on the capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device.

(Claim 1, as amended) Claim 1 recites a request for a reformatted email attachment that “includes an identification of the reformatted attachment and transformation parameters that ... are based on the capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device.” The Examiner correctly admits that neither Rabe-Hesketh nor Moussa disclose “wherein the request includes transformation parameters that indicate how to transform the particular attachment to the reformatted attachment.” Thus, because neither Rabe-Hesketh nor Moussa teach or suggest a request that includes transformation parameters, neither reference can teach or suggest a request that includes transformation parameters that “are based on the capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device.”

Bakshi discloses a network client that sends user determines transformation parameters with a request to download content. However, Bakshi's transformation parameters are user determined and are not based on the capabilities of the recipient device. Thus, because Bakshi does not disclose transformation parameters based on the recipient device, Bakshi does not teach or suggest a request for a reformatted email attachment that “includes an identification of the reformatted attachment and transformation parameters that ... are based on the capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device.”

In addition, because Rabe-Hesketh discloses a link the references an original attachment, Rabe-Hesketh does not teach or suggest a request for a reformatted email attachment that “includes an identification of the reformatted attachment.” Furthermore,

because Moussa reformats an attachment without linking to that reformatted attachment, Moussa does not disclose a request for the reformatted attachment. Thus, Moussa cannot teach or suggest a request for a reformatted email attachment that “includes an identification of the reformatted attachment.”

Bakshi discloses a network device that makes a request for content. However, Bakshi is silent on whether that request includes an identification for a reformatted attachment. Thus, Bakshi does not teach or suggest a request for a reformatted email attachment that “includes an identification of the reformatted attachment.”

Thus, none of Rabe-Hesketh, Moussa, or Bakshi teaches or suggests a request for a reformatted email attachment that “includes an identification of the reformatted attachment and transformation parameters that ... are based on the capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device.” as recited in claim 1. Applicants' receiving a request is supported in Figure 6, block 601 and at Page 16, Lines 9-11; Page 37, Lines 23 – 28.

Therefore, claim 1 and claims 2-25 that depend on claim 1 are not obvious over Rabe-Hesketh, Moussa, and Bakshi.

Claim 26 as amended recites:

In an online system, a method for providing digital images to target devices, the method comprising:  
    receiving an e-mail message having one or more attached objects;  
    detecting capabilities of an intended recipient's receiving device, wherein the detecting is performed dynamically, during a request from the intended recipient to retrieve the e-mail message;  
    responsive to detecting the intended recipient's receiving device and responsive to identifying the objects as exceeding capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device, detaching said objects from said message;  
    for each detached object, generating a request allowing retrieval of a transformed copy of the detached object, wherein the generated request

includes an identification of the transformed copy of the detached object and transformation parameters that indicate how to transform that detached object to the transformed copy of the detached object, and wherein the transformation parameters are based on the capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device;

automatically transforming copies of said objects to a resolution fidelity that is more useful to said target devices based on the transformation parameters; and

delivering the e-mail message to the target devices, the e-mail message including said generated request for each detached object.

(Claim 26, emphasis added). As noted above, none of Rabe-Hesketh, Moussa, or Bakshi teaches or suggests “the generated request includes an identification of the transformed copy of the detached object and transformation parameters ... are based on the capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device.” Therefore, claim 26 and claims 27-33 that depend on claim 26 are not obvious over Rabe-Hesketh, Moussa, and Bakshi.

Claim 46 as amended recites:

An e-mail system for providing e-mail having attachments, the system comprising:

an e-mail server for:

receiving a particular e-mail message having an attachment, the particular e-mail message being addressed to a recipient having a target device capable of receiving e-mail, the attachment including one or more objects, and

detecting capabilities of the target device, wherein the detecting is performed dynamically, during a request from the recipient to retrieve the e-mail message;

a transformation module for transforming the objects of the attachment to a desired format, based on capabilities of the target device; and

an attachment processing module for replacing the attachment with at least one request responsive to detecting the target device and responsive to identifying the attachment as exceeding capabilities of the target device, wherein the at least one request allows retrieval of at least one of the transformed objects and the at least one request includes an identification of the at least one of the and transformation parameters that indicate how to transform the at least one of the transformed objects, and

wherein the transformation parameters are based on the capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device;

a retrieval module allowing retrieval of the transformed objects, in response to invocation of at least one request.

(Claim 46, emphasis added). As noted above, none of Rabe-Hesketh, Moussa, or Bakshi teaches or suggests “at least one request includes an identification of the at least one of the transformed objects and transformation parameters ... are based on the capabilities of the intended recipient's receiving device.” Therefore, claim 46 and claims 47-50 that depend on claim 46 are not obvious over Rabe-Hesketh, Moussa, and Bakshi.

Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the amendments and discussion set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, the present claims should be found to be in condition for allowance.

If a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Eric Replogle at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges/credits, please charge/credit our deposit account no. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: July 6, 2009

/Judith Szepesi/  
Judith A. Szepesi  
Reg. No. 39,393

Customer No. 08791  
12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025  
(408) 720-8300